



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JAMES G. BLAINE AND THE PAN AMERICAN MOVEMENT

INTRODUCTION

The idea of forming closer pan-American relations is not a new one, nor was it by any means original, in this country, with Mr. Blaine. Others before him had desired closer relations with Hispanic America but with less success in the accomplishment.¹ On the other hand, there had been expressed in the former Spanish colonies at various times strong desires for closer inter-Hispanic, if not always inter-American, relations, and with actual results. However, none of these movements before the period concerned had proved of much great importance *per se*, but, with all, they were not devoid of important results.

The first of these movements began with the idea in the mind of Simón Bolívar,² the Liberator, of the northern part of South

¹ Stephen A. Douglas had suggested a "general union for commercial purposes" to embrace "all the various political communities on the American Continent and the adjacent islands, from the frozen ocean to the Isthmus of Panama". "A uniform system of tariff duties and commercial regulations" was to be drawn up which would "not fail to stimulate and encourage all the branches of industry" in the several countries. All this was to be accomplished "without molesting or necessarily changing their political relations, national affinities, and forms of government". It would put an end to all ambitious schemes of aggression and invasion with a view to conquest and annexation. It would insure the inviolability and integrity of the territorial limits of each of the allied countries. In a word, Douglas saw a great commercial Union similar to the German Zollverein which would bind together all the nations in the western hemisphere and "which would afford more encouragement and protection to all branches of American industry than all the protective tariffs that the ingenuity of man ever devised". See Stephen A. Douglas, *An American Commercial Union and Alliance*, Washington, Thos. McGill and Company, 1889, pp. 36. As early as 1820 Henry Clay had announced a plan to establish a "human freedom league in America" embodying "all nations from Hudson's Bay to Cape Horn" (H. Von Holst, *The Constitutional and Political History of the United States*, 8 vols., Chicago, Callaghan and Company, 1877, I, p. 413).

² About 1810, however, although with little material result, "The Declaration of Rights of the Chilian People" was made by Juan Martínez de Rosas, suggesting

America, when in 1815, while an exile in Jamaica, he wrote what has since been known as his "prophetic letter" under date of September 6, 1815. "How beautiful it would be," he thought.

for the Isthmus of Panama to be for our nations what the Corinthian Isthmus was for the Greeks. Would to God that some day we might enjoy the happiness of having there an august Congress of representatives of the republics, kingdoms and empires of America to deal with the high interests of peace and of war with the nations of the other three parts of the world.

It was indeed a noble dream, but not until eleven years later was it partially fulfilled.³ On December 7, 1824, while Bolívar was at the head of the Chilean government, he sent invitations to such a congress to Colombia, Mexico, Central America, Brazil, and the United Provinces of Buenos Aires. He did not intend, seemingly, to invite the United States, but the governments of Colombia and Mexico, claiming to have conceived the idea at the same time as Bolívar, desired to have the United States participate.⁴ As a result, in the spring of 1825, the ambassadors of Colombia and Mexico verbally inquired of Clay, the American secretary of state, whether an invitation to the congress would be acceptable. The cautious President Adams desired more

that the people of Hispanic America unite, "not in an internal organization but for external security against the plans of Europe, and to avoid war among themselves. . . . The day when America, united in a Congress, whether of the two continents, or of the South, shall speak to the rest of the world, her voice will make itself respected and her resolve would be opposed with difficulty" (John Barrett, *Pan-Americanism and the Monroe Doctrine*, address, February 19, 1916, before Illinois State Bar Association, p. 21).

³ "As early as 1821 the idea of forming a close connection between the Spanish colonies in Central and South America, then engaged in revolution, had been suggested by Colombia. A few months before their independence was recognized by the United States, a treaty was negotiated between Colombia and Chile (July, 1822), in which a convocation of a congress of the new republics was contemplated. The construction of a "continental system of America, which should 'resemble the one already constructed in Europe,' was the apparent project of these two powers." See H. Von Holst, *The Constitutional and Political History of the United States*, I, 409-410; W. S. Robertson: *Rise of Spanish American Republics*, New York, Appleton, 1918, p. 229.

⁴ Jose Ignacio Rodriguez, in *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4, 51st cong., 1st sess., 1889-90, XVI. 155-156.

information regarding the subjects to be discussed, the organization and method of procedure, etc., of the congress. Very unsatisfactory answers were given, however, to those questions by the two mentioned governments, but Clay, while not overlooking this fact, declared that the president had decided to accept the invitations.⁵ However, the proposition was so "raked over the coals", the "most innocent portion" being "held up as the source of sure destruction"⁶ that when it was actually decided to send delegates the congress had adjourned.⁷ "The practical failure," said John Bassett Moore.⁸

of the United States to be represented at the Congress of Panama was an unfortunate omen. Indicative in itself of an attitude somewhat unsympathetic, this impression was deepened by the arguments by which the opposition to the mission was sustained.

The failure of the Congress of Panama did not discourage the various nations from the idea, and, five years later, the Mexican government invited the American Republics to meet once more

⁵ Von Holst: *The Constitutional and Political History of the United States*, I. 410.

⁶ *Sen. Ex. Doc.*, No. 232, part 4, 51st cong., 1st sess., 1889-90, XVI. 7-12 *passim*; on March 25, 1826, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the house reported adversely on the question, pp. 85-88.

⁷ President Adams in his Annual Message of December 6, 1825, asserted the invitation had been accepted and that United States representatives would be commissioned to attend the Congress. See James D. Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, II. 302; also *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4, XVI. 7-12; Secretary Clay provided Anderson and Sergeant, the two United States delegates to the congress, with elaborate instructions dated May 3, 1826. (George F. Tucker, *The Monroe Doctrine*, Boston, George B. Reed, 1885, pp. 34-35; *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4). The Congress met at Panama, June 22, 1826, and held ten meetings, the last one being on July 15. Only Colombia, Central America, Peru, and Mexico were represented. The Chilean legislature failed to appoint its delegates. Brazil and the United Provinces of La Plata failed to send representatives. It was provided that the congress should meet every two years at Tacubaya, Mexico. A treaty of union and perpetual confederation was signed July 15, 1826. A convention was drawn up to provide for an army of 60,000 troops, furnished proportionately from the various countries, for defense and support of the scheme. See José Ignacio Rodríguez, in *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4, *op. cit.*, pp. 111, 165, and 173-174.

⁸ John Bassett Moore, *Principles of American Diplomacy*, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1918.

in a congress either at Panama, Tacubaya, or Lima. The invitation, which was dated March 13, 1831, was probably never accepted by any of the Hispanic-American states, for at least the project was never carried out. Again, on December 18, 1838, the same government repeated its request for a congress, urging Venezuela, at the same time, to join with it. The subjects to be considered were plans for defense against foreign aggression, methods for settling inter-American disputes by mediation, and the formation of a code of public law regulating mutual relations. As nothing again materialized, the Mexican government repeated its request on August 6, 1839, and again on April 2, 1840. To this latter appeal the government of New Granada alone answered (1840) accepting with enthusiasm the offer; but again the scheme did not mature.⁹

Finally in 1847, the Republics of Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, New Granada, and Peru decided to carry out the idea of closer relationship and a congress met at Lima, Peru, December 11, 1847. It held nineteen meetings and adjourned on March 1, 1848, *sine die*. Its results, as far as actual accomplishment of ends was concerned, were practically nil. Treaties of confederation and commerce and navigation were drawn up as well as a postal treaty and a consular convention, the latter alone being the only one approved and that only by the government of New Granada. All the other treaties became dead letters.¹⁰

On September 15, 1856, the governments of Peru, Chile and Ecuador entered into and signed, at the city of Santiago, Chile, an agreement known as the "Continental Treaty" for the purpose of "cementing upon substantial foundations the Union which exists" between them "as members of the great American family". The Peruvian government was given the task of communicating the results of this meeting to the other governments of Hispanic America, and inviting them to adhere to its aims. Because of the feeling against the United States due to

⁹ José Ignacio Rodríguez, *op. cit.*, pp. 202-203.

¹⁰ José Ignacio Rodríguez, *op. cit.*, p. 203. No invitation was extended to the United States.

the late Walker activities, the northern republic was not asked to join.¹¹

In 1864 (January 11), the government of Peru issued an invitation to all the former Spanish governments of America to once more unite in a conference to be held at Lima, or at another place to be designated. The object of the congress was to devise "measures of accomplishing a Latin-American Union" by organizing them into a single family of Spanish-American nations to better facilitate epistolary correspondence, to insure general peace and respect of fundamental institutions, to settle boundary disputes, to replace war by arbitration, and to provide for punishment of the Hispanic-American Revolutionary peace breakers. The first meeting was held on November 14, 1864. The sessions were secret and Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, Colombia, Guatemala, Peru, Argentina, and Venezuela were represented. Once more nothing of value was accomplished.¹²

On September 3, 1880, the governments of Colombia and Chile signed a treaty of arbitration which provided that in case either party should ever be unable to agree upon an arbitrator of their disputes, the matter was to be submitted to the president of the United States for settlement. Article three of the treaty provided that

The United States of Colombia and the Republic of Chili will endeavor, at the earliest opportunity, to conclude with the other American nations conventions like unto the present, to the end that the settlement by arbitration of each and every international controversy shall become a principle of American public law

However, on October 11, 1880, before the treaty was ratified, Colombia issued an invitation, in the form of a circular letter, to all the republics of South America to attend a congress to be convened at Panama in September, 1881, for the purpose of

¹¹ *Ibid.*, *op. cit.*, p. 207. The compact, it may be said, never became a law.

¹² When Colombia promised to attend the congress, it expressed "the opinion that the United States ought not to be invited, because their policy is adverse to all kinds of alliances, and because the natural preponderance which a first-class power, as they are, has to exercise in the deliberations might embarrass the action of the Congress" (Rodriguez, *op. cit.*, pp. 209-210).

securing adherence of all the Hispanic American states to the agreement of September 3, 1880. The United States was not invited due

to the reason that the position assigned to the government of the United States by the proposed treaty is to maintain and exercise a friendly and judicial impartiality in the differences which may arise between the powers of Spanish-America.

Fourteen nations replied but because of the continuation of the War of the Pacific between Chile and Peru and Bolivia the congress was never held.¹³

The above constituted the attempts to call a congress of "selected"¹⁴ American governments. At about this point, the American secretary of state under Garfield came upon the stage of American diplomacy, and it was largely owing to his interest in the Pan-American idea that the present movement toward that end received its initial stimulus.

James G. Blaine became secretary of state on March 4, 1881, and held office until December 19 of the same year. He was described by his friends as a "magnetic", honest, and noble character; and by his enemies as the very opposite.

Whether Mr. Blaine considered the past inter-American movements as an omen of a better age, or whether he considered them at all is not for one to say. In all probability he considered such schemes of little value which did not include the United States. In this sense his policy was a jealous one for this country in that he desired to increase our trade with Hispanic America at the expense of European nations. The idea of a union to promote peace seems to have been secondary in his mind,¹⁵ although, as will be seen later, he desired to secure Hispanic-American tranquillity first in order to obtain its trade.¹⁶

¹³ *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4, pp. 217-221 and 222-249; John Bassett Moore, *The Principles of American Diplomacy*, pp. 385-386.

¹⁴ This term is used literally for in each case the assemblages were not made up of all the nations concerned due either to volition or circumstance.

¹⁵ This conclusion has been reached only after a careful study of Blaine's writings, speeches, etc.

¹⁶ See Blaine's letter to the *Chicago Weekly Magazine*, September 16, 1882.

It is not only enough to study the motives back of his policy, but one must notice the effect of such plans upon the public at the time. While Blaine was secretary of state¹⁷ the administration was involved in many and important foreign questions, and perhaps one of the least of these, as looked at by the public eye, was the policy of closer relations with Hispanic America. During 1880 to 1882 the fact that an attempt had been made to call the Hispanic-American powers to a conference was practically overshadowed by the diplomatic episode between the United States on one hand and Chile, Peru, and Bolivia on the other. And in 1889-90 when the first Pan-American Conference did occur, what comment there was did not seem to be very general, and, except in some foreign countries where it was looked upon as being a direct blow to their trade, was not very loud nor prolonged.

The War of the Pacific began in the spring of 1879 and lasted until 1883.¹⁸ "This occurrence", said John Bassett Moore,

naturally revived the thoughts which had so often been cherished of the formulation of a plan for the preservation of peace among the American nations.¹⁹

And Blaine affirmed later that at this point

the foreign policy of President Garfield's administration had two principal objects in view, first, to bring about peace, and prevent future wars in North and South America; second, to cultivate such friendly

¹⁷ March 4-December 19, 1881; March 4, 1889-June, 1892.

¹⁸ On the War of the Pacific, and Blaine's policy in connection therewith, see the following: *Foreign Relations*, 1881, 1882; Hall, *Mr. Blaine and his Foreign Policy*, Boston, 1884; *House Report No. 1790*, 47th cong., 1st sess., *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 79*, 47th cong., 1st sess.; Blaine, *Political Discussion*, p. 343; Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, VIII., 86, 89, 130, 170. For further accounts see any life of James G. Blaine, including Gail Hamilton, chap. XVI, and *Letters of Mrs. James G. Blaine*, Vol. I., under years 1881 and 1882; for foreign attitude toward Blaine's policy regarding War of Pacific see *New York Daily Tribune*, November 24, 1881, December 14, 1881, and December 15, 1881. An editorial favorable to Blaine's policy will be found in the *New York Daily Tribune* for December 14, 1881.

¹⁹ John Bassett Moore. *Principles of American Diplomacy*, p. 385.

commercial relations with all American countries as would lead to a large increase in the export trade of the United States.²⁰

First, then, Mr. Blaine attempted to secure peace by diplomatic means and at the same time assemble the nations of America in a congress for the promotion of peace and commerce. As has been seen, the first met with no success and heaped upon its author the criticism of a goodly number of persons in this country, in South America, and in Europe. The second step will now be examined more in detail.

While yet in the senate of the United States,²¹ Blaine had made a study of "the resources, needs, aspirations, [and] possibilities of the Southern Hemisphere". He was in favor of giving aid to a line of steamships to Brazil. He believed that if the United States' trade with Hispanic America was not soon increased, Europe would obtain it all. He advised a tariff to promote, among other things,

the increase of commercial exchange and the establishment of practical as well as theoretical independence of foreign countries.²²

He looked upon Canada as falling in line with these ideas and believed that there remained only to add Hispanic America and the scheme of a great commercial union of the western hemisphere would be complete.²³ This was a Utopia of the dreamer, but Mr. Blaine felt that it would not be long before it might be fulfilled, and, not being a dreamer merely, he began action toward that end.

Whether the idea of a peace conference originated in the mind of President Garfield, as Blaine afterward asserted, one has reasons to doubt, especially since it is known that the executive was dominated by the secretary, who was a vigorous supporter of such ideas. Moreover, in all available works of Garfield, no mention

²⁰ Blaine's letter to the *Chicago Weekly Magazine*, September 16, 1882.

²¹ This was in the winter, particularly, of 1877-78. See Gail Hamilton, *Biography of James G. Blaine*, p. 439 ff; Gail Hamilton (Abigail Dodge) was the niece of Mr. Blaine.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 503-504.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 504-506.

is made of his policy nor of his attitude toward South America. Only in the writings of Blaine and Gail Hamilton (Blaine's niece and disciple) does one find this mentioned.²⁴

However, before any definite results could be accomplished toward calling a peace congress, the president was incapacitated by the fatal shot of July 2, 1881, and on the 18th of September he died. Thereupon Chester A. Arthur immediately assumed the office of chief executive.

Some time previous to the assassination of President Garfield on July 2, 1881, an agreement had been reached between the president and the secretary of state, to the effect that a conference of all the American states should be called to meet in Washington, in order to consider and discuss the prevention of war among the various states of this hemisphere.²⁵ Because of Guiteau's crime the plan was postponed but finally on November 29, 1881, the invitation was sent by Mr. Blaine. The congress was to convene in Washington, on November 22, 1882, and had for its sole aim

to seek a way of permanently averting the horrors of cruel and bloody combat between countries, oftenest of one blood and speech, or the even worse calamity of internal commotion and civil strife. . . . For some years past a growing disposition has been manifest by certain states of Central and South America to refer disputes affecting grave questions of international relationship and boundaries to arbitration

²⁴ See Gail Hamilton, pp. 506, 510, 519-520, and James G. Blaine, *James A. Garfield* (Memorial address pronounced in the House of Representatives February 27, 1882, before the Departments of the Government of the United States by James G. Blaine, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1882, p. 48). Also see Blaine's open letter addressed to President Arthur in the *New York Tribune*, Saturday, February 4, 1882, as well as Blaine's letter to the *Chicago Weekly Magazine*, September 16, 1882.

²⁵ On January 21, 1880, a bill, No. 1095, 46th cong., 2nd sess. had been introduced into the United States senate, by David Davis of Illinois at the request of Mr. Hinton Rowen Helper, to encourage closer commercial relationship between the United States and the several republics of South and Central America and Brazil. The scheme involved the building of a transcontinental railroad. The Conference was to meet in Washington the third Monday in June, 1880, and \$50,000 was to be appropriated to defray expenses. The bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce. See *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4, 51st cong., 1st sess., pp. 293-4.

rather than to the sword. It has been on several such occasions a source of profound satisfaction to the government of the United States to see that this country is in a large measure looked to by all the American powers as their friend and mediator. . . . The existence of this growing tendency convinces the President that the time is ripe for a proposal that shall enlist the good-will and active co-operation of all the states of the western hemisphere, . . . in the interest of humanity and for the common weal of nations. He conceives that none of the governments of America can be less alive than our own to the dangers and horrors of a state of war, and especially of a war between kinsmen. He is sure that none of the chiefs of governments on the Continent can be less sensitive than he is to the sacred duty of making every endeavor to do away with the chances of fratricidal strife. And he looks with hopeful confidence to such active assistance from them as will serve to show the broadness of our common humanity and the strength of the ties which bind us all together as a great and harmonious system of American Commonwealths. . . . The President is especially desirous to have it understood that, in putting forth this invitation, the United States does not assume the position of counseling, or attempting, through the voice of the Congress, to counsel any determinate solution of existing questions which may now divide any of the countries of America. Such questions cannot properly come before the Congress. Its mission is higher. It is to provide for the interests of all in the future, not to settle the individual differences of the present. For this reason, especially, the President has indicated a day for the assembling of the Congress so far in the future as to have a good ground for hope that by the time named the present situation in the South Pacific coast [War of the Pacific] will be happily terminated, and that those engaged in the contest may take peaceable part in the discussions and solution of the general question affecting in an equal degree the well-being of all.

It seems also desirable to disclaim in advance any purpose on the part of the United States to prejudice the issues to be presented to the Congress. It is far from the interest of this government to appear before the Congress as in any sense the protector of its neighbors or the predestined and necessary arbitrator of their disputes. The United States will enter into the deliberations of the Congress on the same footing as the other powers represented, and with the loyal determination to approach any proposed solution, not merely in its own interest, or with a view to asserting its own power, but as a single member

among many co-ordinate and coequal states. So far as the influence of this government may be potential, it will be exerted in the direction of conciliating whatever conflicting interests of blood, or government, or historical tradition may necessarily come together in response to a call embracing such vast and diverse elements.²⁶

Before any answers could be received from the various countries regarding the Peace Congress, Mr. Blaine was superseded as secretary of state by Frederick T. Frelinghuysen who assumed office December 19, 1881.²⁷ The first answer, of which all received were of acceptance, was that of Venezuela, dated January 7, 1882.²⁸ Perhaps Gúzman Blanco, President of that Republic, expressed the opinion of a majority of the states when he said:

. . . The idea is so transcendental, elevated, far-seeing, and practical that . . . I hasten personally to express . . . my felicitations to the President and statesmen who direct the policy of

²⁶ *Foreign Relations of the United States*, vol. for 1881, pp. 13-15; the Congress was to be held under the auspices of the United States government which was to supply a meeting place, take charge of all necessary arrangements, meet all the material requirements of the congress, and provide for reporting, interpreting, and printing all the proceedings and protocols in Spanish as well as in English. The only expense to be incurred by the other countries was that of maintaining their commissioners. Two commissioners were to be sent by each state represented, one of whom could preferably speak English. See also *Foreign Relations* 1882, pp. 384, 385, enclosures Nos. 3 and 5, in No. 332.

²⁷ "Mr. Blaine," the *New York Nation* said editorially December 15, 1881, "retires leaving considerable diplomatic confusion behind him, and fully justifying the apprehension which we expressed when he took office, that he would prove 'rockety and journalistic' ". If it had not been for Mr. Garfield's illness and death "he would by this time have made far more trouble for us than he has". Then followed a sharp criticism of Blaine for his Chile-Peru-Bolivia diplomacy and entirely overlooking his peace congress scheme. In the same paper under the same date we are informed that "The appointment of Mr. Frelinghuysen as Secretary of State will be generally regarded as a 'safe' one. . . . He is without that brilliancy which likes to exhibit itself, and that restless ambition which constantly wants to be doing something."

²⁸ Guatemala answered January 12, 1882; Brazil, February 8; Salvador, February 13; Nicaragua, February 14; Honduras, February 20; Bolivia, February 24; Costa Rica, February 25; and Mexico, March 23 (*Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4 51st cong., 1st sess., pp. 258-269). Before the other states could accept, the invitations were recalled.

North America. The future of South America may be looked upon as assured under the safeguard of the great Republic, which is at once our teacher and our model.²⁹

Two days after the date of the first acceptance of the invitation by an Hispanic-American state the invitation was practically cancelled by Secretary Frelinghuysen,³⁰ when, in a communication addressed to Mr. Trescott,³¹ he said:

The United States is at peace with all the nations of the earth, and the President wishes, hereafter, to determine whether it will conduce to that general peace, which we would cherish, for this government, to enter into negotiations and consultations for the promotion of peace with selected friendly nationalities without extending a like confidence to other people with whom the United States is on equally friendly terms. If such partial confidence would create jealousy and ill-will, peace, the object sought by such consultation, would not be promoted. The principles controlling the relations of the republics of this hemisphere with other nationalities may, on investigation, be found to be so well-established that little would be gained at this time by reopening a subject which is not novel.

As a result of this statement of affairs and the hint at the impracticability of holding a peace congress by the secretary of state, Mr. Blaine wrote, under date of February 3, 1882, an open letter to President Arthur as follows:³²

The suggestion of a Congress of all the American nations to assemble in the city of Washington for the purpose of agreeing on such a basis of arbitration for international troubles as would remove all possibility of war on the western hemisphere was warmly approved by your predecessor. The assassination of July 2 prevented his issuing the invitations to the American states. After your accession to the Presidency, I acquainted you with the project and submitted to you a draft for such an invitation. You received the suggestion with the most appreciative con-

²⁹ Blanco to United States Minister, Carter, Caracas, January 5, 1882 (*Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4, 51st cong., 1st sess., p. 258).

³⁰ James G. Blaine, *Political Discussions, Legislative, Diplomatic and Popular*, 1856-1886. Norwich, Conn., Henry Bell Publishing Company, 1887, p. 406.

³¹ *Foreign Relations*, 1882, pp. 57-58.

³² *New York Tribune*, February 4, 1882.

sideration, and after carefully examining the form of the invitation, directed that it be sent. It was accordingly dispatched in November. . . .

After quoting the above dispatch of Frelinghuysen's, he continued:

If I correctly apprehend the meaning of these words it is that we might offend some European powers if we should hold in the United States a Congress of 'selected nationalities' of America. This is certainly a new position for the United States to assume, and one which I earnestly beg you will not permit this government to occupy. . . . Two presidents of the United States in the year 1881, adjudged it to be expedient that the American powers should meet in Congress for the sole purpose of agreeing upon some basis for arbitration of differences that may arise between them, and for the prevention, as far as possible, of war in the future. If that movement is now to be arrested for fear that it may give offense in Europe, the voluntary humiliation of this government could not be more complete, unless we should petition the European governments for the privilege of holding the Congress.

The meeting of such a congress, he said, would place the United States in an enviable position in the eyes of European states and could not possibly create jealousy and ill-will toward us upon their part. Instead, it would gain prestige for the United States government. The menace of Hispanic American conflicts

influenced President Garfield, and, as I supposed, influenced yourself to desire a friendly conference of all the nations of America to devise methods of permanent peace and consequent prosperity for all. Shall the United States now turn back, hold aloof and refuse to exert its great moral power for the advantage of its weaker neighbors?

The ex-secretary admonished the president not to recall the invitations before considering the dire results, and added:

Those you have invited may decline, and, having now cause to doubt their welcome, will, perhaps, do so.

After suggesting that the assembling of the Congress might prove of great advantage in increasing our Hispanic American trade, he concludes:

It will in all events be a friendly and auspicious beginning in the direction of American influence and American trade in a large field which we have hitherto greatly neglected and which has been practically monopolized by our commercial rivals in Europe.³³

Perhaps, influenced somewhat by Blaine's public letter, and perhaps, by other circumstances, President Arthur, on April 18, 1882, in a special message to congress in which he submitted the circular invitation to a peace congress, said:³⁴

In giving this invitation I was not aware that there existed differences between several of the Republics of South America which would militate against the happy results which might otherwise be expected from such an assemblage. The differences indicated are such as exist between Chile and Peru, between Mexico and Guatemala, and between the states of Central America. It was hoped that these differences would disappear before the time fixed for the meeting of the Congress. This hope has not been realized.

Having observed that the authority of the President to convene such a Congress has been questioned, I beg leave to state that the Constitution confers upon the President the power, by and with the consent of the Senate, to make treaties, and that this provision confers the power to make all requisite measures to initiate them, and to this end the President may freely confer with one or several commissioners or delegates from other nations. The Congress contemplated by the invitation could only effect any valuable results by its conclusions eventually taking the form of a treaty of peace between the states represented; and, besides the invitation to the states of North and South America is merely a preliminary act, of which constitutionality or the want of it can hardly be affirmed.

³³ One critic of Mr. Blaine (Hall, *Mr. Blaine and His Foreign Policy*, pp. 28-29), in speaking of this letter, said that it is "an excellent example of a certain mental phenomenon which an incisive writer has defined as a fixed idea, generating a detailed narrative, to support and confirm it." "How a peace Congress can 'insure production and consumption' and 'stimulate the demand for articles which American manufacturers can furnish with profit' it is impossible to see. The decay of our South American trade is due to our high tariff. . . . The evil cannot be cured by a synod of gentlemen engaging in the discussion of abstract principles" (meaning a peace Congress). The *New York Nation* (February 9, 1882) called the letter a "political manifesto, if not a declaration of war against the administration".

³⁴ Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, VIII. 97-98.

It has been suggested that while the international Congress would have no power to affect the rights of nationalities, there represented, still Congress might be unwilling to subject the existing treaty rights of the United States on the Isthmus and elsewhere on the continent to be clouded and rendered uncertain by the expression of the opinion of a Congress composed largely of interested parties.

I am glad to have it in my power to refer to the Congress of the United States, as I now do, the propriety of convening the suggested international Congress, that I may thus be informed of its views, which it will be my pleasure to carry out.

Inquiry having been made by some of the Republics invited whether it is intended that this international Congress shall convene, it is important that Congress should at as early a day as is convenient inform me by resolution or otherwise of its opinion in the premises. My action will be in harmony with such expression.³⁵

³⁵ On May 15, 1882, the *New York Daily Tribune* contained a letter addressed to the Editor and signed; "Hickory". It may have been written by Gail Hamilton, although there is no proof to that effect. "I am sure there must be a 'felt want' in the State Department. An immediate addition to the library should be made of Quackenbos' *Rhetoric* and Mrs. Ward's *Home Manners*. . . . We are again called upon to reconcile conflicting emotions over the President's sincere but shying hospitality." After declaring caustically that we should overlook the "little bickerings when we invite company" such as the Hispanic American states, and, if possible, rather compose them instead of drawing their attention to them, the writer reprimands the president for calling off the congress so early. "Hospitable if spasmodic host, what is the hurry? Time is not half up yet . . . only five months have gone. There are seven months still left for our wayward sisters to kiss and be friends. . . . What has frozen the general current of the President's soul that gushed so peacefully last fall? What blight has fallen on the executive heart, that the hope which, in November, 1880, was strong enough to bud and bloom into a full-blown invitation to distant countries, has now in this green-growing April, wilted into a petition to an unconcerned Congress at home?" In speaking of a possible recall of the invitation, the writer says: "But great heavens, Mr. President, the deed is done. . . . What sort of home manners is this which invites people thousands of miles away, and four months after appeals to a Congress, which confessedly has nothing to do with the matter, to know whether it is proper or not." "Has the United States been accustomed to play this practical joke on the world?" The whole message is "better suited to boudoir chat than to the smooth, matured conclusions of a state paper". We should not expect from the State Department such "varied inelegance of this school-girl syntax. . . . What remains for the United States to do? Congress must say either yes or no. If yes, will the President issue another invitation affirming that the first was a 'feeler'? . . . and how are the Republics to know that four months hence the President may not be

Turning now to the action taken in congress during the period in question (until the end of 1882) with respect to an all-American movement, it will be noticed that the first step was taken on February 1, 1882, when Senator Windon introduced a resolution to the effect that the president inform the senate by submitting all correspondence relating to the proposed peace congress.³⁶ On February 6, 1882, Mr. Springer introduced a resolution into the house stating that since a letter had recently appeared in the newspapers purporting to be the invitation to the peace congress and signed by Blaine, and since the president had not mentioned the matter in his message of December 1, 1881, and requesting the president to inform the house whether the said letter was a correct or incorrect copy and to submit all correspondence regarding the peace congress to the house, together with the authority under which the president can call such a congress. This was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.³⁷ On February 20, 1882, Mr. Call introduced into the senate a resolution to the effect that the United States should adopt measures to settle the War of the Pacific, and to convene a

seized with another qualm and appeal, say to the Supreme Court for its opinion of the propriety of the measure? . . . And suppose Congress says no. Will we write to the Republics: 'You shall not come. I had a perfect right to invite you and I did invite you. But, Congress, which had no finger in the pie till I took and jabbed it in, now pronounces against the pie, and so do I. I gave the invitation, not thinking much about it, and never dreaming you would accept. But seeing you stir in the matter, I bestirred myself also, and take it all back.' In either case, whether Simon says up or Simon says down, the President is predestined to wiggle-waggle."

In an editorial under date of April 21, 1882, the *New York Tribune* accuses Frelinghuysen of casting a doubt in the president's mind as to the propriety of calling such a congress: "Suppose President Arthur should now invite the members of the Diplomatic Corps to dine at the White House on the 1st of May and a few days hence Mr. Frelinghuysen should whisper around in social circles of Washington that the President was not quite sure that the dinner would come off and then the President publicly asked Congress whether it was wise" to give such a dinner. "That is precisely what the President has done with the independent governments of North and South America."

³⁶ *Congressional Record* (Senate), 47th congress, 1st sess., XIII., part 1, p. 781. This was called for by request of Secretary Blaine. See Blaine's letter to *New York Tribune* of February 2, 1882.

³⁷ *Congressional Record* (House), 47th cong., 1st sess., XIII., part 1, 924.

peace congress at Washington, for the purpose of settling all existing disputes and for preventing others in the future.³⁸ On April 24, 1882, Mr. Cox of New York introduced a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in regard to the calling of a peace congress to consider, besides peace, trade reciprocity.³⁹ On the same day, Mr. Cockrell introduced into the senate a bill providing for a paid commission to visit Hispanic America for the purpose of obtaining facts "to be utilized in extending friendly and commercial intercourse" and to determine the attitude of Hispanic America toward an international railroad and postal communication.⁴⁰ Also on the same day, Mr. Morgan of Alabama, introduced into the senate a bill to promote "closer commercial relations" between this country and the Hispanic American states, and provide for the building of an intercontinental railroad. The president was authorized to convene a congress of American states in Washington at a time to be fixed in 1882.⁴¹ On June 19, 1882, Mr. Moore introduced a bill into the house for the purpose of establishing an international peace commission, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.⁴² On June 28, 1882, Mr. Hoar introduced a joint resolution confirming the original invitation of the president to a peace congress to be held in Washington on November 22 of the same year, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.⁴³ On July 3 a similar resolution was introduced into the house by Mr. Wance and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.⁴⁴

³⁸ *Ibid.* (Senate), part 2, p. 1284. The bill was laid on the table but was considered, March 14, 1882 (*ibid.*, p. 1888), when Mr. Call spoke upon it (*ibid.*, p. 1891).

³⁹ *Ibid.* (House), part 4, p. 3226.

⁴⁰ *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4, 51st cong., 1st sess., 1889-90, XVI. 294-295. A similar bill was introduced into the house and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 295-297. This bill had been introduced into the senate on January 21, 1880, and referred to the Committee on Commerce. A similar bill was introduced into the house also on April 24, 1882, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. On June 20, 1882, it was recommended that it be not passed.

⁴² *Congressional Record* (House), 47th cong., 1st sess., XLII., part 5, p. 5090.

⁴³ *Ibid.* (Senate), part 6, p. 5430.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* (House), part 6, p. 5595.

It was now July and still no legislative action resulting in definite preparation for a peace congress had been taken.⁴⁶ The next month, on August 9, 1882, Secretary of State Frelinghuysen, in a circular letter⁴⁶ to our representatives in the Hispanic American states, definitely recalled the invitations to the congress, stating that the president had hoped that by the date set for the convening of the congress all the questions dividing the American nations would have been settled, but

that inasmuch as that peaceful condition of the South American republics which was contemplated as essential to a profitable and harmonious assembling of the Congress does not exist, and having, besides, on the 18th day of April, 1882, submitted the proposition to Congress, without evoking an expression of its views on the subject, and no provision having been made by it for such a Congress, he is constrained to postpone the projected meeting until some future day.

While thus giving due notification to the friendly governments interested, the President cannot but express his belief that the fact of such a Congress having been called has not been without benefit, it having directed the attention of the people of the United States, as well as of the republics, of South America, to the importance of having a more defined policy, to be satisfactory to 'all, governing the international relations of the republics. . . .

In response to this formal revocation of the invitation some of the Hispanic American states communicated an answer.⁴⁷ Guatemala

expressed great regret that a project of such vital importance to the Central American states should have failed even temporarily and hoped it would be revived at no distant day.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Between June 5, 1882 and August 7, twenty-three petitions had been introduced into both houses of congress requesting that such a peace conference be called. The states represented by these were Michigan, Vermont, Iowa, Texas, North Carolina, Massachusetts, Indiana, Tennessee, Nebraska, Ohio, and the District of Columbia.

⁴⁶ *Foreign Relations*, 1882, p. 4.

⁴⁷ *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4, 51st cong., 1st sess., pp. 273-277. Ecuador responded September 16, 1882, Salvador October 3, Uruguay, October 12, and Paraguay, October 17.

⁴⁸ Blaine, *Political Discussions, Legislative, Diplomatic, and Popular*, p. 406.

Salvador regretted the step because the congress would have exerted the

most beneficent and transcendent influence in promotion of the tranquillity and progress of the nations of the Continent.

and hoped that "so beneficent an idea" had

not been abandoned, and that later, when the exceptional conditions through which several sister republics are now passing shall have changed for the better, it may prove possible to realize in practice with enthusiasm and success this grand idea. . . .⁴⁹

Uruguay spoke of the plan as being a "felicitous idea" and believed that the results of the congress would have

proved exceedingly efficacious in the maintenance of peace in the countries of America thus promoting their progress and welfare.⁵⁰

On the day (September 16, 1882) that the first response to the revocation of the peace congress was written there appeared in the *Chicago Weekly Magazine* a letter from James G. Blaine which, taken together with the statement made by President Arthur in his annual message to congress of December 4, 1882,⁵¹ closes this first episode in the Pan-American movement.

Mr. Blaine stated in his letter that President Garfield's administration had as its purpose a two-fold foreign policy; first, to bring about peace in South America; and, second, to cultivate commercial relations which would prove profitable to the United States. He continued:

To attain the second object the first must be accomplished. . . . As soon as the project was understood in South America, it received a most cordial approval. . . . There can be no doubt that within a brief period all the nations invited would have formally signified their readiness to attend the Congress. . . ."

⁴⁹ *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4, 51st cong., 1st sess., pp. 275-276.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 276-277.

⁵¹ Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, VIII. 131.

After briefly reviewing the step which have been followed in detail, he stated that, in referring the subject to congress there would have resulted, if it had been considered at any length, a debate greatly "intermixed with personal and party politics, and the project would be ultimately wrecked" as was the usefulness of the Panama Congress of 1826 by the same process. "The time for Congressional action would have been after the Peace Congress had closed its labors." Continuing he said:

The assembling of the Peace Congress . . . was not in derogation of any right or prerogative of the Senate or House. The money necessary for the expenses of the Conference—which would not have exceeded \$10,000—could not, with reason or propriety, have been refused by Congress. If it had been, patriotism and philanthropy would have promptly supplied it.

It is the duty, Mr. Blaine asserted, of the United States to restore and keep peace among the other American republics, for if this could be accomplished, "a most significant and important result would have followed. . . . A friendship and an intimacy would have been established between the states of North and South America, which would have demanded and enforced a closer commercial connection." As a further result a trade conference would probably have taken place in the near future from which "the United States could hardly have failed to gain great advantages".

After summarizing the trade situation between the United States and Hispanic America and discussing the protective tariff and free trade policies of the United States, he concluded:

In no event could harm have resulted from the assembling of the Peace Congress. Failure was next to impossible. Success might be regarded as certain. . . . The labors of the Congress would have probably resulted in a well-digested system of arbitration. . . . Such a consummation would have been worth a great struggle and a great sacrifice. It could have been reached without any struggle and would have involved no sacrifice. It was within our grasp. It was ours for the asking. It would have been a signal victory of philanthropy over the

selfishness of human ambition; a complete triumph of Christian principles as applied to the affairs of nations. It would have reflected enduring honor on our country, and would have imparted a new spirit and a new brotherhood to all America. Nor would its influence beyond the sea have been small. The example of seventeen independent nations solemnly agreeing to abolish the arbitrament of the sword, and to settle every dispute by peaceful methods of adjudication, would have exerted an influence to the utmost confines of civilization, and upon the generations of men yet to come.⁵²

On December 4, 1882, President Arthur, in his second annual message to congress, concluded, after reviewing the steps taken regarding the peace congress:

I am unwilling to dismiss this subject without assuring you of my support of any measures the wisdom of Congress may devise for the promotion of peace on this continent and throughout the world, and I trust that the time is nigh when, with the universal assent of civilized peoples, all international differences shall be determined, without resort to arms, by the benignant processes of arbitration.⁵³

Thus the episode was closed only to be revived again some seven years later with the peace congress a *fait accompli*. There remains now only to examine very briefly the attitude of public opinion toward the movement just detailed. As one of Mr. Blaine's biographers⁵⁴ has aptly said, Frelinghuysen's reversal of Blaine's foreign policy

left Mr. Blaine in the unfortunate position of having proposed and entered upon a course of action which was so suddenly abandoned as to leave it without fair trial. He was judged by the ragged ends of his policy,⁵⁵

and especially by the stand he had taken in the war of the Pacific.

⁵² *Chicago Weekly Magazine*, September 16, 1882.

⁵³ Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, VIII. 131.

⁵⁴ C. W. Balestier, *James G. Blaine*, New York, R. Worthington, 1884, p. 178.

⁵⁵ Mr. Blaine naturally was extremely disappointed by this fact and Mrs. Blaine (*Letters of Mrs. J. G. Blaine*, I. p. 276) wrote: " . . . The presidency may go, but he would like to carry out his ideas of statecraft in 1885 as Secretary of State." See Gail Hamilton for similar statement in a later letter of Mrs. Blaine, p. 564. Mr. Blaine himself stated before a meeting of the Committee of the House of Representatives which during the spring of 1882 inquired into Mr.

In an editorial dated February 9, 1882, the *New York Nation* remarked:

On the whole . . . the great American Confederation appears to us to be an ephemeral conception, and the president has done well in declaring, through Mr. Frelinghuysen, that, as to this project, he 'prefers time for deliberation'. Deliberation will probably be the end of it.

Carl Schurz was extremely opposed to Blaine's policy with regard to Hispanic America, saying that the United States must "especially beware of the tropics". He further accused Blaine of grandstand play in this respect, saying that he is

a peculiarly objectionable example of those politicians to whom politics is a sport—a great game played before millions of spectators—in which success means triumph of a person rather than the promotion of social truth and justice.⁶⁶

Mrs. Blaine, in a letter to her daughter in Paris, December 26, 1881, said, when speaking more especially of Blaine's dealing with Chile, Peru, and Bolivia,

your father's policy, which is decidedly American, you will see very much criticized, and you must remember that this is really greatly to his credit. A policy which European countries applaud, could not be very American.⁶⁷

On the other hand, there were many persons in profound sympathy with this policy.⁶⁸ John Sherman, in a speech at

Blaine's policy in dealings with the belligerents in the War of the Pacific: "If there is any chapter in my life . . . of which I am proud, and of the complete vindication of which in history I feel sure, it is that in connection with the policy laid down by the administration of President Garfield with respect to South America" (*House Report No. 1790*, 47th cong., 1st sess., p. 1242). He was also convinced that the United States would have to "assume a much more decided tone in South America", or else "back out" and surrender that demand to Europe (*House Report No. 1790*, 47th cong., 1st sess., p. 352).

⁶⁶ *Reminiscences of Carl Schurz*, 3 vols., New York, The McClure Company, 1908, III. 404.

⁶⁷ Mrs. Blaine's *Letters*, 277.

⁶⁸ The campaign material of 1884 in support of Blaine of course favored his policy with regard to South America. Perhaps the coolest expression of this

Washington, ratifying the nomination of Blaine and Logan on June 19, 1884, spoke in favor of Blaine's policy: "What we want now is an American policy broad enough to embrace the Continent . . . until there shall be a brotherhood of republics".⁵⁹ Edward Everett Hale, who had had many conversations with Mr. Blaine during the years 1880 to 1884, and who was a profound believer in international peace, by the end of Arthur's administration "had come to feel that the question was one of deep importance".⁶⁰ In a speech of Senator Harrison at Cincinnati, Ohio, the ideas of Mr. Blaine regarding a peace congress were reviewed and commented upon as being greatly beneficial to both this country and Hispanic America.⁶¹ Mrs. Blaine said:

His policy is a patriotic one, and the people are going to so recognize it. Not a selfish thought is in it, but it is in all its ramifications, American.⁶²

So much, then, for this phase of the situation; the next step is to examine the period between 1882 and the convening of the first Pan-American Peace Congress in 1889.

may be found in *The Lives of the Four Candidates, including the Biography of Each*, Chicago, Elder Publishing Company, 1884. "So far as it (his South American policy) is understood by the people, it is believed to be broad, patriotic, and generous. It struck an according sentiment in the people of the country." *Ibid.*, p. 41.

⁵⁹ *Recollections of Forty Years in the House, Senate and Cabinet* (Sherman), II. 888-889.

⁶⁰ Edward Everett Hale, Jr., *The Life and Letters of Edward Everett Hale*, 2 vols., Boston, Little, Brown & Company, 1917, II. 380.

⁶¹ C. W. Balestier, *James G. Blaine*, pp. 183-185. The speech was made prior to 1884. For more campaign material see J. C. Ridpath, *Life and Public Services of James G. Blaine*, Boston, Martin Garrison Company, 1884. *The Chicago Tribune* was also an upholder of Blaine's Hispanic American policy with respect to a peace congress.

⁶² Mrs. Blaine, *Letters*, I. 296-297. This statement was made partly in connection with his Chilean policy as well as with his peace congress policy. "What difference," she writes with reference to Frelinghuysen's reversal of Blaine's policy, "does it make to him [Blaine] that Frelinghuysen is a nice man who does a dirty thing? He knows the act and the man, and holds the latter to account for the former." Letter dated February 2, 1882, to M. in Paris. Many other letters were written expressing this and similar thoughts. See Vol. I., pp. 293-295, 300-301, 306-307, 312-313; and Vol. II., pp. 13-14.

INTERIM 1882-1889

On February 8, 1883, Mr. Cockrell of Missouri introduced a bill similar to that of April 24, 1882⁶³ providing for the appointment of a special commission to visit Hispanic America to acquire information regarding the feelings of those peoples toward strengthening commercial relations with the United States. At the same time a similar bill was introduced into the house.⁶⁴ On December 11, 1883, Senator Sherman re-introduced a bill similar to that which had been previously introduced by Mr. Morgan of Alabama, April 24, 1882,⁶⁵ to provide for an Hispanic-American Commission which, among other things, was to determine the attitude of Hispanic American states toward building a transcontinental railroad. A similar bill was also introduced into the house by Mr. Jordan of Ohio.⁶⁶ On the 7th of January, 1884, Mr. Townshend of Illinois introduced into the house a joint resolution

requesting the President to invite the co-operation of the governments of American nations in securing and establishing a free commercial intercourse among those nations and an American Customs Union.

This also provided for a system of weights and measures. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce where it died.⁶⁷ Two months later, on March 3, Mr. Cockrell introduced into the senate a similar bill to the ones proposed previously on April 24, 1882, and February 8, 1883, providing for a paid Hispanic-American commission consisting of three men serving a two-year term. The bill, with the extra feature providing for a commercial congress of American states, was favorably reported and made an amendment to the diplomatic and consular appro-

⁶³ See note 40.

⁶⁴ *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4, p. 297. This bill was reintroduced by Mr. Cockrell into the Senate on March 3, 1884. See page 45.

⁶⁵ See note 41.

⁶⁶ *Sen. Ex. Doc. 232*, part 4, p. 297.

⁶⁷ *Congressional Record* (House), 48th cong., 1st sess., XV., part 1, p. 241.

priation bill of 1884. To this Secretary Frelinghuysen objected.⁶⁸ The bill in its final form as passed was embodied in the act of congress making appropriations for the consular and diplomatic service of the government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1885. It provided:

For three commissioners to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, at a compensation of \$7,500 each. Said commissioners shall ascertain the best modes of securing more intimate international and commercial relations between the United States and the several countries of Central and South America; and for that purpose they shall visit such countries in Central and South America as the President may direct. . . .

G. H. Sharpe of New York (resigned in March, 1885, and replaced by William E. Curtis), S. O. Thacker, and Thomas C. Reynolds were appointed the three commissioners.⁶⁹ A bill to

⁶⁸ "I am thoroughly convinced of the advisability of knitting closely our relations with the states of this continent, and no effort on my part shall be wanting to accomplish a result so consonant with the constant policy of this country." He then stated that the added feature of a peace congress was objectionable to him in this case and at this time and added: "I fear that a Congress so soon to meet without previous conference with the several governments, and without the preparation of a well-digested programme for discussion, might be unable to accomplish a valuable result. The views of the states which are to be parties to the conference should be obtained, their wishes and aims carefully considered, and thereupon the scope and purpose of the Congress carefully defined and outlined in the invitation." After offering other objections to too hasty preparation for a congress, he adds: "The true plan, it seems to me, is to make a series of reciprocity treaties with the states of Central and South America. . . . By these treaties we might secure . . . further substantial advantages, such, for example, as the free navigation of their coasts, rivers and lakes." He suggested, too, that it would be of advantage to have a uniform silver coin used in trade with these countries. Finally, he suggested that the president of the United States appoint a commission to consider the interests of the countries; to send delegates to confer with the Hispanic-American governments and ascertain their desires, and then report to the president and if he sees fit, to call a convention of Hispanic-American states. See *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4, pp. 298-308.

⁶⁹ *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4, pp. 298-309. During 1884-1885 the commission held several conferences with the merchants and manufacturers in Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New York, New Orleans, and San Francisco, and afterwards visited the Hispanic-American countries. As a result they recommended that "an invitation be extended by the United States to the several other govern-

the above effect had been introduced into the house and favorably reported May 7, 1884.⁷⁰

On December 21, 1885, Mr. Townshend re-introduced his joint resolution of January 7, 1884, to establish a customs union of American republics. This bill was adversely reported on April 15, 1886.⁷¹ On January 26, 1886, Mr. Worthington introduced into the house a joint resolution giving the president power to call a congress of American states, to arrange for the arbitration of all national differences. On April 15, 1886, this resolution was also reported adversely.⁷² The next month, on February 8, Mr. H. R. Helper re-introduced into both houses of congress a bill authorizing the president to call a congress of American nations to meet some time in 1886 to consider questions of reciprocal commercial relations and the construction of a transcontinental railroad. This bill likewise was reported adversely.⁷³ Senator Logan of Illinois, on February 15, 1886, introduced a bill authorizing the president to send delegates to an international American congress to arrange for "arbitration of all national differences". The delegates were not to exceed ten in number and were to be divided equally among the political parties, and serve without pay. On May 6 this

ments of America to join at Washington in a conference to promote commercial intercourse and to prepare some plan of arbitration." "Unless," they continued, "we have been completely misled by the expressions and protestations of the ruling powers of each and every one of the governments we have visited, the only estrangement possible between them and us will flow from our own indifference and neglect. . . . Every President and Cabinet officer, every leading and thoughtful citizen we met, joined in the sentiment of justified surprise that our country had taken the initiative by this embassy in bringing about more cordial and hearty connection between the various republics and our own." If it be possible to carry out this plan, "we shall plant seed in a genial soil, beneath a propitious sky." Report to accompany bill, House of Representatives, 7884, p. 320, *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4. See also Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, VIII., 239-240, in regard to the commission in the Fourth Annual Message of President Arthur, December 1, 1884; also *ibid.*, p. 276, for report concerning same by President Arthur on February 13, 1885, and 370 for the final report sent to Congress by President Cleveland January 12, 1886.

⁷⁰ *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4, p. 308.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 308-310.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 310-311.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 311.

bill suffered the same fate as the preceding ones.⁷⁴ On February 23, 1886, Senator Frye of Maine introduced a bill "to promote the political and commercial prosperity of the American nations". The president was authorized to invite the Hispanic-American states to meet at a congress to be held at Washington, October 1, 1887, to decide upon questions of "mutual interest and common welfare". Each state was to have one vote regardless of the number of its delegates. The questions to be considered were: (a) promotion of peace; (b) an American customs union; (c) the establishment of steamship lines between Pan-American ports; (d) the establishment of a uniform system of customs regulations; (e) the adoption of a uniform system of weights and measures; (f) the protection of property, patent rights, copyrights, and trademarks; and (g) the formulation of a plan of arbitration. One hundred thousand dollars was to be appropriated to defray the expenses of the meeting. The president was to appoint, with the advice and consent of the senate, twenty-four delegates to represent the United States, three of whom should be versed in international law and the remaining in agriculture, manufacture, and the export and import trade. On May 6, 1886, this bill was favorably reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an added eighth item in the list of considerations for the congress to the effect that the delegates could consider any other subject relating to the welfare of the states concerned. Also the secretary of state was to provide for the printing and publication of all the proceedings of the conference. The report of the committee was accompanied by a long statement by the members of the South American commission. At the request of Senator Whitthorne the bill was taken up and considered on June 12, 1886. On June 17, the Senate passed the bill and it was straightway sent to the house and referred to the committee on foreign affairs but no action was taken.⁷⁵

On March 16, 1886, Mr. Reagan of Texas introduced into the house a bill to provide for a conference of American nations

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 311-312.

⁷⁵ *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 4, pp. 312-313 and 329-373.

to determine a standard silver trade coin "and for other purposes". The congress was to meet within six months after the passage of the bill at a place agreed upon by at least three of the governments to be represented.⁷⁶ On the 29th of the same month, William McKinley of Ohio introduced a bill in the house for the purpose of convening a congress "to arrange the settlement of natural differences by arbitration". This meeting was to be held in Washington or New York. Not more than twelve delegates should represent the United States, and these were to be divided equally among the leading political parties. Six of these persons were to be versed in international law. Some \$30,000 were to be appropriated to cover expenses.⁷⁷ The same day Mr. McCreary of Kentucky introduced into the house a bill to give the president power to call a congress of Hispanic-American states to "encourage peaceful and reciprocal commercial relations". Three commissioners were to be appointed to represent the United States.⁷⁸ On April 15, 1886, this bill was favorably reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the house with one slight addition—that the congress should also consider the "promotion of arbitration". The sum of \$20,000 was to be appropriated to defray expenses. The report was accompanied by elaborate statistics demonstrating the desirability of such a conference; but stating that such a body must not be given power to make final and definite treaties. There was also submitted a minority report signed by Perry Belmont stating: (1) that the aims were only vaguely mentioned; (2) that the provisions were indefinite; and (3) that the president did not initiate the bill and therefore might not approve the acts which the conference should recommend to the United States government and consequently its work would be of no avail as far as we were concerned. This report was likewise elaborated greatly by statistics.⁷⁹

At the beginning of the first session of the Fiftieth Congress, Sherman re-introduced Mr. Helper's bill in the senate regarding

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 313-314.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 315.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 314.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 315-329.

the intercontinental railroad. Also Mr. Reagan re-introduced his bill to provide for a congress of American states to decide upon a common silver trade coin. Mr. Frye of Maine again introduced his bill which had passed the senate in 1886 and on February 15, 1888, it was reported again favorably from the Committee on Foreign Relations.⁸⁰ In the house, Mr. McKinley re-introduced his bill for determining a plan of arbitration while Mr. Yardley introduced a similar bill in the upper house.⁸¹

On January 4, 1888, Mr. Townshend introduced in the senate a bill "to promote the establishment of free commercial intercourse among the nations of America and the Dominion of Canada by the creation of an American Customs Union or Zollverein." The measures to be considered were practically the same as those which had been suggested by Senator Frye on January 26, 1886. The Congress was to be called by the president on the second Monday in March, 1889, at Washington. Each nation was to have one vote. The United States delegates were to be appointed by the president with one from each state in the union, and to be divided equally among the political parties. They were to serve without pay. One hundred thousand dollars was to be appropriated to pay the expenses of the meeting.⁸²

On the same day, January 4, Mr. McCreary re-introduced his bill of March 29, 1886, into the senate to the effect that the president be authorized to arrange for an international conference. On February 9, 1888, it was reported back favorably. On February 29, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the house reported the bill favorably. Finally, on March 21, 1888, Mr. Frye, after substituting his bill of February 23, 1886, for the one in question, reported the same favorably, and on March 22, it was passed by the senate. The bill then went into conference of a committee appointed March 28. The conference report was submitted to the house and adopted on April 4, 1888, but on the 25th of April it was rejected by the senate. On the 27th, a new conference was ordered, and an agreement being reached, the

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 373.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 375.

⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 373-5.

bill was finally passed on the 10th of May, 1888, and on the 24th, it became a law without the president's signature.⁸³

Thus have been traced the legislative steps whereby the congress of 1889-90 was made an accomplished fact. And, as chance would have it, James G. Blaine was once more in the chair of the secretary of state with his cherished hopes about to be realized. The *New York Nation* of October 10, 1889, in commenting on the situation, asserted⁸² that the "law of the last Congress was intended, no doubt, by Democrats in the House, for the benefit of themselves and Cleveland," but the "unexpected democratic defeat of last November has placed the character of our future relations with South America in the hands of Mr. Blaine and of the Republican party. . . .

As the end of the first Cleveland administration wore away, Blaine steadfastly refused to allow his name to be again placed in nomination. Benjamin Harrison was accordingly nominated by the republican party and elected with a republican majority in both houses of congress.

On January 17, 1889, Harrison wrote to Blaine offering him the position of secretary of state. "We have already," he said,

a pretty full understanding of each other's views as to the general policy which should characterize our foreign relations. I am especially interested in the improvement of our relations with the Central and South American states. . . . In all this I am sure you will be a most willing coadjutor, for your early suggestions and earnest advocacy have directed public attention to the subject.⁸⁴

On January 21, Blaine accepted the offer, but made at that time

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 375. The *New York Nation* said on October 10, 1889, in speaking of this bill, that it was "the work of a Democratic Foreign Affairs Committee of the last House, promoted in the Senate by Senator Sherman." On September 12, 1889, it spoke of the law as being "so diffuse and sprawling that it embraces among the objects to be sought by the Conference almost everything a government can attempt."

⁸⁴ Gail Hamilton, *Biography of James G. Blaine*, pp. 651-652. Mrs. Blaine was greatly impressed with this letter to her husband and in a letter to Jamie, January 20, 1889, said: "Your father will accept this trust, and gladly" (*Letters*, II., 231).

no particular mention of the South American affairs to which Harrison had alluded.⁸⁵

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL AMERICAN CONFERENCE 1889-90

Under date of July 13, 1888, the then secretary of state, T. F. Bayard, in accordance with the act already mentioned, issued invitations to all the governments of Central and South America, together with Haiti and San Domingo.⁸⁶ "I have to call your particular attention," he said,

to the scope and object of the conference suggested, which, as will be observed, is consultative and recommendatory only. The proposed conference will be wholly without power to bind any of the parties thereto, and it is not designed to affect or impair in any degree the treaty relations now existing between any of the states which may be represented.

Certain topics were to be discussed,⁸⁷

but the field is expressly left open to any particular state to bring before the conference such other subjects as may appear important to the welfare of the several states represented.

The meeting was scheduled to open at Washington, on October 2, 1889. Each state was to determine the number of its delegates, but could have only one vote.⁸⁸ On August 10, 1888, the

⁸⁵ Gail Hamilton, *Biography of James G. Blaine*, p. 653; also Mrs. Blaine's *Letters*, II. 234. Mrs. Blaine wrote later (II. 253): "Mr. Blaine enjoys the return to the State Department . . . thoroughly." But a little later in a letter to H., March 15, 1889 (II. 257) she wrote that Harrison "is of such a nature that you do not feel at all at liberty to enjoy yourself".

⁸⁶ *Pan-American Conferences and Their Significance*, supplement to the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, May, 1906, p. 6; also *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 1, 51st cong., 1st. sess., 1889-90, XIV. 9-11.

⁸⁷ See *ante*, the bill introduced by Senator Frye on February 23, 1886, for the eight propositions to be discussed; also *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 231*, 51st cong., 1st sess., 1889-90, XIII, 1-2.

⁸⁸ *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 1, pp. 9-11.

first state to reply, Guatemala, sent its note of acceptance.⁸⁹ In all there were eighteen states represented.⁹⁰

On October 1, 1889, the *New York Tribune* contained an editorial aiming to show that public opinion was now ready for such a conference as was about to assemble,

It may be instructive to recall the acrid criticisms and envenomed denunciations which the original proposition called forth in 1881. Mr. Blaine's enemies then condemned as incipient Jingoism and a policy of diplomatic adventure this statesmanlike expedient for bringing the nations of the continent into closer and more harmonious relations with one another. They ridiculed it as a fantastic and "viewy" scheme. . . . The Congress is now about to meet for the same objects contemplated by Secretary Blaine in 1881,⁹¹ and there is neither criticism nor ridicule from any quarter. . . . Partisanship succeeded in temporarily discrediting it eight years ago, but an enlightened public opinion now accepts and sanctions it as the embodiment of the best and oldest traditions of American diplomacy. . . .

Whether public opinion in this country was particularly stirred by the convening of the First Pan-American Conference or not the public was assured that

the assembly has been regarded with much more interest and even curious anticipation in Europe than in this country. It seems to be the European apprehension that there will be a commercial Union of the

⁸⁹ Haiti was the last republic to answer, its note of acceptance being dated October 4, 1889, two days after the conference had convened (*Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 1, pp. 12-29).

⁹⁰ This number does not include Hawaii, which, according to a resolution adopted by the senate February 12, 1890, and the house March 17, and approved by the president, provided for an invitation to be extended to the kingdom of Hawaii to be represented at the conference. As this step was taken so very late, Mr. Blaine, in a letter to Mr. Carter of the Hawaiian legation, dated March 20, 1890, suggested that he should act as the tentative representative of that government until one could be appointed. On March 25, 1890, Mr. Carter accepted Mr. Blaine's suggestion. It was not until the day the conference adjourned. April 19, 1890, that the Hawaiian king accepted the invitation. See *Sen. Ex. Doc., No. 232*, part 1, pp. 29-37.

⁹¹ The original invitation in 1881 embodied only the arrangement of a plan for the promotion of peace in the western hemisphere.

North and South American states which will practically exclude other countries.⁹²

In South America there was "almost absolute indifference" on the part of the press of those countries in regard to the congress of American states.

Nothing but the vaguest references to the matter are to be encountered, and these, while expressing an amiable desire for political friendship with the United States, do not at all contemplate any efforts to promote commercial interests.⁹³

At noon on October 2, 1889, the first meeting of the international American conference was opened with thirteen states represented.⁹⁴ The delegates representing the United States were: John B. Henderson, Clement Studebaker, Cornelius N. Bliss, T. Jefferson Coolidge, John F. Harrison, Wm. Henry Trescott, Morris M. Estes, Henry G. Davis, Charles R. Flint and Andrew Carnegie.⁹⁵ After a few minutes of predetermined

⁹² *Harper's Weekly*, October 12, 1889. In the same issue is found the attitude of the chief newspapers of Austria. "There is . . . every reason for reflecting seriously regarding this matter, and for not dismissing it as being too far removed. It would be a serious loss to Europe if the politicians of Washington should succeed in uniting the whole American continent . . . by insurmountable customs barriers."

⁹³ From *Las Novedades*, April 26, 1889, quoted by the *New York Nation* May 9, 1889. This paper at the time was spoken of as the official organ of Spain and South America in the United States and was never enthusiastic over the conference, for nothing could result, it said, but "empty talk". This is an extreme view, of course. On the other hand, we find a great number of persons waxing enthusiastic at the prospect of such a meeting and its results. An earnest hope for future results might be expressed in the words of Dr. Vilarde of Bolivia, a delegate to the conference: "We pray for the introduction into our country of North American energy and business methods" (*Harper's Weekly*, October 12, 1889).

⁹⁴ *Sen. Ex. Doc.*, No. 232, part 1, p. 38. The meetings were held in the Wallack Mansion on the corner of Eighteenth and I streets, Washington. The whole edifice had been fixed up as a clubhouse for the delegates, the actual meetings being held in the ballroom (*New York Herald*, October 1, 1889).

⁹⁵ *Sen. Ex. Doc.*, No. 231, p. 3, The *New York Herald* of October 1, 1889, spoke of these men as being all—save one or two—the "personal, political or business friends" of Mr. Blaine. It then gave a brief sketch of the public life of each. For a list of the Hispanic-American delegates, see *New York Herald*, October 2, 1889. The *New York Nation*, September 12, 1889, in speaking of the delegates, said that

parliamentary maneuvering, James G. Blaine was elected to the position of president of the conference and thereupon addressed the assemblage in a brief speech.⁹⁶ "No conference of nations," he said,

has ever assembled to consider the welfare of territorial possibilities so vast and to contemplate the possibilities of a future so great and so imposing. . . . We meet in the firm belief that the nations of America ought to be and can be more helpful each to the other than they now are, and that each will find advantage and profit from an enlarged intercourse with the others. . . . It will be a great gain when we shall acquire that common confidence on which all international friendship must rest. It will be a greater gain when we shall be able to draw the people of all American nations into a close acquaintance with each other, an end to be facilitated by more frequent and more rapid intercommunication. It will be the greatest gain when the personal and commercial relations of the American states, south and north, shall be so developed and so regulated that each shall acquire the highest possible advantage from the enlightened and enlarged intercourse of all.⁹⁷

the Hispanic-Americans will only be able to speak Spanish and French and very little English, while the United States delegates will only be able to speak English! The *New York Nation*, on May 9, 1889, cautioned the people of this country not to regard the leaders of Hispanic America as "children in arms". The delegates to the conference were considered by some to be superior in caliber to those of the United States.

⁹⁶ It had been forecast by many papers that Mr. Blaine would be elected to the position of president of the conference. See *New York Tribune*, October 1, 1889.

⁹⁷ *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 1, p. 38. In commenting on this speech, *Harper's Weekly* said, October 19, 1889, it "was felicitous and suitable. It was wisely confined to pleasant and picturesque generalities. It assumed nothing but good feeling, and suggested nothing but harmony. Like other diplomatic utterances, it was intended to say nothing of importance, and it said nothing with grace and skill." The *New York Nation*, October 10, 1889, spoke of Mr. Blaine's remarks as being "a sonorous evasion of the chief ostensible object for which the Conference was drawn up", since not a word was said on reciprocal commercial treaties. Such talk as his "always sounds well whether in Sunday School or on the rostrum of a graduating class". On the other hand, the *New York Herald*, October 4, 1889, spoke of the speech as being "in the happiest vein of that eloquent gentleman. As a welcome to the Nation's guests it was graceful, warm, and generous. He showed rare tact in avoiding all discussion of the subject which calls the delegates together and which will be debated further on when the Congress assumes a more formal shape."

After these remarks Mr. Blaine declared the conference adjourned to meet again only after the official tour of the country by the delegates should have been completed.

The aim of this interesting excursion of the nation's guests at the conference, which lasted from October 3 to November 14, 1889, was primarily for the purpose of impressing upon them the greatness and resources of the United States. Very elaborate preparation had been made by the state department which had organized the tour. A group of military officers, well qualified in the Spanish and Portuguese tongues, were detailed to act as aids to the party. The Pennsylvania Railroad Company undertook to carry the delegates over the entire route of 5,406 miles in a special train of the most luxurious type the nation had yet seen. There was to be no change of cars and the same engine was to be used throughout the trip, which was a novelty for this period. The most minute details were planned ahead of time so that the comfort of the delegates would be perfect.⁹⁸

At 8:15 on the morning of October 3, 1889, the journey commenced. The delegates went first to West Point, then to New York, to Boston and to the manufacturing centers of New England. From there they journeyed through Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, and back to Illinois and Indiana, into Kentucky and thence back to Washington. The trip occupied forty-two days and the delegates were pretty thoroughly tired out but they had been given a great impression of the wealth, and resources of our country and for that reason the trip was counted successful.⁹⁹

On November 18, 1889, the congress again convened in its second meeting and began to organize for business.¹⁰⁰ The mode of procedure was similar to that of the United States congress. Bills were introduced and referred to committees

⁹⁸ *New York Herald*, October 1, 1889. See the same paper for October 4 also.

⁹⁹ *New York Tribune*, November 10, 1889. The *London Times*, while the trip was in progress, reported the movements of the delegates, generally stating how impressed they were with what they saw and how tired they were becoming.

¹⁰⁰ The first to the fifteenth meetings, inclusive, were taken up in passing on the credentials of the delegates and on organization. From the sixteenth to the seventieth meeting (the last one), the time was spent in the discussion of subjects

for consideration and report. After being reported back from the committees they were then considered by the whole body of delegates, debated, and voted upon.¹⁰¹

Turning now to the actual work of the conference, it will be noted that on January 15, 1890, the report of the Committee on Weights and Measures was submitted to the delegates. On January 24, it was discussed, voted upon, and passed after amendment.¹⁰² On February 15, 1890, the Railroad Committee reported, and on February 26, its report was discussed and adopted without amendment.¹⁰³ On February 28, the Committee on Customs Unions reported on the subject of Reciprocal Treaties, and on March 17, 24, 29 and April 2, 7, 10, and 12 the matter was discussed. It was finally recommended that any country desiring to form such a treaty was encouraged to do so.¹⁰⁴

On March 24, after the Committee on Communications on the Atlantic had submitted its report, the matter was discussed and adopted without comment.¹⁰⁵ Also the same day the Committee on Pacific Communication reported and its views were adopted without amendment to the effect that maritime, telegraphic, and postal communication was to be encouraged and

for consideration. See *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 231*, p. 90 *et seq.* There was much time spent in quibbling over whether the meetings should be secret or not, and, towards the end, in trying to decide when the conference should adjourn. See *ibid.*, pp. 121-172 and *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 1, pp. 55-59. There was some further delay, also, due to translation of speeches.

¹⁰¹ Blaine attended forty-four of the seventy meetings, which he opened and closed. Meetings lasted from twenty minutes to four or five hours or more. Gail Hamilton said (p. 680) that whenever affairs "became too involved" Mr. Blaine was sent for and "all differences were quickly adjusted". See also *Sen. Ex. Doc., No. 231*, pp. 112-114, and 142-143.

¹⁰² *Sen. Ex. Doc., No. 232*, part 1, pp. 77-92.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, pp. 93-102. In accordance with this measure an Intercontinental Railway Commission met at Washington, December 4, 1890, and held nineteen meetings, the last one being April 21, 1891. Very elaborate surveys were made over the territory considered for the railroad and the final report was published at Washington, in 1895-98, (namely, *International Railroad Commission Report*) in eight large volumes containing text, tables, maps and profiles.

¹⁰⁴ *Sen. Ex. Doc., No. 232*, part 1, pp. 103-264.

¹⁰⁵ *Sen. Ex. Doc., No. 232*, part 1, pp. 265-75. This had to do with increase of steamship and other communication between the American nations.

facilitated between American ports.¹⁰⁶ The report of the Committee on Communication on the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea was considered on March 21 and on the same day was adopted without amendment.¹⁰⁷ On January 2, the delegate from Mexico had submitted a resolution regarding the nomenclature of merchandise, and on February 10 the Committee on Customs Regulations submitted its report of the matter. The discussion took place on February 19, and on the same day it was concurred in.¹⁰⁸ On March 29, the report of the Committee on Customs Regulations concerning the classification and valuation of merchandise was adopted.

On April 14, there was discussed and adopted the matter of the formation of a Bureau of Information which afterwards became the Bureau of the American Republics. On April 11, 1890, there was adopted the report of the Committee on Port Dues regarding harbor fees and regulations which had been submitted to the conference on March 5 and discussed on March 18, 19, 20 and April 10 and 11. At the same time that this was being discussed there was adopted a resolution with regard to consular fees on March 25.

The month previous to this, on February 28, a resolution concerning sanitary regulation was adopted. On March 3, a report regarding Patents and Trademarks was concurred in, and on the next day, March 4, one concerning private International Law was adopted.

On April 2, 1890, a resolution was adopted relating to an International Monetary Union. On April 14, the report of The Committee on Banking was adopted having to do with the formation of an international bank. The next day a resolution was agreed to respecting the extradition of criminals. Three days later, on April 18, the report of the Committee on Interna-

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 276-311. The report was submitted to the conference on March 14, 1890.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 312-342. The committee submitted its report to the conference on January 27. It provided for government aid "in establishment of first-class ship service between the several ports". The governments benefited were to give a proportional monetary aid.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 343-50.

tional Law was adopted with regard to claims and diplomatic intervention. The same day a report concerning river navigation was adopted which had been introduced on April 12 and discussed on the day of its passage. It was recommended and adopted, also, on this day, that in the future all differences between an American power and an European power be settled by arbitration,¹⁰⁹ and that the

principle of conquest, during the continuance of the treaty of arbitration, be recognized as admissible under American public law.

Also there should be no cessions of territory while the treaty was in effect if made under threat of war.¹¹⁰

Finally on the last day, April 19, 1890, a plan was adopted providing for the arbitration of all disputes. This had been submitted to the conference by the Committee on General Welfare on April 9; and had been discussed on April 14, 16, 17 and 19, when it was finally adopted.¹¹¹

The conference had now completed its work and the time had come for it to close. The final scene was that of Mr. Blaine delivering the concluding remarks.¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ *Sen. Ex. Doc., No. 232*, pp. 1084-1121. A resolution had been introduced on January 20, by a Venezuelan delegate respecting the British Claims.

¹¹⁰ This principle was discussed and adopted April 18 (*ibid.*, pp. 1122-1148). Other miscellaneous subjects were discussed in this session regarding a memorial tablet to commemorate the meeting, and the building of a memorial library to be used as an archive for Hispanic American literary, historical, and geographical material. A resolution to thank Mr. Blaine and the officers of the conference was concurred in also (*ibid.*, pp. 1153-1168).

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 954-1083. Of this John Bassett Moore said later: "As yet this plan represents but an aspiration, since it failed to secure the approval of the governments whose representatives adopted it" (*Principles of American Diplomacy*, p. 388). On the last day, resolutions were adopted to honor the Four Hundredth Anniversary of the discovery of America by Columbus and to thank the United States government for its hospitality (*Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 232*, part 2, pp. 1153-1168).

¹¹² The Conference by unanimous resolution tendered their "sincere thanks" to Mr. Blaine "for the ability, impartiality, and courtesy" with which he had "discharged his duties as President of this Conference" (*Sen. Ex. Doc., No. 231*, pp. 815-816). He was also presented with a loving cup—(Gail Hamilton, *Biography of James G. Blaine*, p. 682).

Gentlemen: I withhold for a moment the word of final adjournment, in order that I may express to you the profound satisfaction with which the government of the United States regards the work that has been accomplished by the International American Conference. The importance of the subjects which have claimed your attention . . . must challenge the confidence and secure the admiration of the governments and peoples whom you represent. . . .

The extent and value of all that has been worthily achieved by your conference cannot be measured today. We stand too near it. Time will define and heighten the estimate of your work, experience will confirm our present faith, final results will be your vindication and your triumph. . . .

May I express to you, gentlemen, my deep appreciation of the honor you did me in calling me to preside over your deliberations. Your kindness has been unceasing and for your formal words of approval I offer you my sincerest gratitude.

Invoking the blessing of Almighty God upon the patriotic and fraternal work which has been here begun for the good of mankind, I now declare the American International Conference adjourned without day.¹¹³

The *New York Nation* in an editorial on April 24, 1890, remarked:

The closing scene of the Pan-American Conference is said to have been extremely affecting, Mr. Blaine being almost moved to tears when he gave the word of parting. If the emotions of the Conference were due to the small results achieved, they were fully justified.

On the other hand, the *New York Tribune* said in a more friendly vein:

The Pan-American Conference has closed its sessions after accomplishing most important, albeit indirect results, . . . [which are] likely to prove momentous and to promote the highest ends of civilization. . . . The Congress has ended, but the work of American unification has barely begun. The ground has been leveled, the way has been opened for securing united action on the part of the eighteen

¹¹³ *Sen. Ex. Doc., No. 231*, pp. 856-858. After the conference the delegates were received by President Harrison who spoke a few words of farewell (*Harper's Weekly*, May 3, 1890).

commonwealths which will promote the enlightened self-interest of each and the common welfare of all; and it now remains for the United States to take the initiative and to complete a great work of high civilization. By conciliatory diplomacy, by the opportune negotiations of treaties, by energetic and intelligent action and by perseverance, and patience and tact, the State Department can accomplish great and memorable results for American civilization. In this work it must have the individual support of public opinion in America. From this day the Monroe Doctrine passes by processes of diplomatic evolution into a stage of higher development. There is an American continental policy to be worked out and consummated.¹¹⁴

In these two views stated by the New York papers is found the whole attitude of the public respecting the first international American conference. Between these two extremes there are of course many half-way points to which the undecided clung.¹¹⁵

During the whole time that the conference was in session and, indeed, before, as well as after, it had ceased its labors, there were the usual partisan accusations generally centered about Blaine. The *New York Nation* remarked before the convention had met for the second time that "it will require a good many American international conferences at Washington to obliterate the impressions created" by some of the phases of "Mr. Blaine's Chilean policy". It asserted further (September 12, 1889) that

the Conference was promoted by Democratic revenue-reformers, and by those protectionists who fancy that free trade will be safe along parallels of latitude, but not safe along parallels of longitude. . . ."

On April 24, after the conference had adjourned, the same paper remarked editorially:

¹¹⁴ *New York Tribune*, April 20, 1890.

¹¹⁵ While the conference was in session these same opinions were continually being expressed by the antagonistic and sympathetic sides. For the opposition see editorials in *New York Nation*, September 12, October 10, 1889, April 24, 1890; the *New York Herald*, October 3, 4, 8, 10, 16, 1889, and February 5, 13, March the conference, but the *New York Tribune* was enthusiastic. See its editorials 31, April 12, and 15. *Harper's Weekly* was also not overly sympathetic toward the conference, but the *New York Tribune* was enthusiastic. See its editorials of October 11 and 15, November 14, 1889, and April 20, 1890.

The ostensible object of the Conference was to promote reciprocity in trade. Its real object was to enable a few steamship owners to get their hands into the United States Treasury.

The *New York Herald* (October 16, 1889) being opposed to Mr. Blaine, generally opposed the conference, calling it "Mr. Blaine's Congress" and saying that it would "accomplish nothing as long as the Republican party remains in power and continues to be the champion of high protection". Harper's weekly (October 19, 1889) uttered the same view when it asserted:

. . . It seems highly improbable that serious results can be achieved by the Congress without concessions upon our part which can hardly be expected.

Besides those who were skeptical, as to the results of the conference and who looked upon it as of small consequence, there were others who took this movement to be a sign of better things. President Harrison was greatly interested in its results saying:

Our people will await with interest and confidence the results which flow from so auspicious a meeting of allied and in large part identical interests.

These results he believed would be along commercial and peaceful lines.¹¹⁶ Elihu Root, in a speech in New York, on December 20, 1889, spoke of the delegates as being

the advance guard in the greatest movement since civilization began toward the brotherhood of man and the federation of the world.¹¹⁷

Chauncey M. Depew spoke of the union of the two American continents as being "the efflorescence of ideas; ideas which in politics give liberty, and in commerce give prosperity".¹¹⁸ While some were advocating no entangling alliances with Hispanic

¹¹⁶ Richardson, *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, Vol. IX, pp. 32-33; First Annual Message to Congress, December 3, 1889.

¹¹⁷ *Sen. Ex. Doc.*, No. 232, part 3. p. 295.

¹¹⁸ Speech, December 20, 1889 in New York.—*Ibid.*, p. 300.

America,¹¹⁹ others were advocating a closer friendship with these governments in order to prevent future bloodshed. John G. Whittier said that if the conference were to agree upon a rule of arbitration only, "its session will prove one of the most important events in the world's history"¹²⁰

Thus was public opinion in this country, which took one side or the other on all the questions of the conference, divided.¹²¹ Turning now to public opinion regarding the meeting, as it was expressed abroad,¹²² other views must be noted. On September 12, 1889, the *Independence Belge*, a Brussels paper, observed that the conference would have no real legislative power and therefore its resolutions could only be carried out by the individual government on their own initiative. "It is clear, then," it concluded, "that the dream cherished by the North Americans is still a long way from its realization."¹²³ The *Diritto* of Rome, Italy, under date of September 30, 1889, saw two dangers arising from an all-American congress.

namely, the hegemony of the Anglo-Saxon over the Latin race, and a coalition of all the states of America against the products of Europe.¹²⁴

The German technical journal, *Stahl und Eisen*, for September, 1889, saw in the coming conference an attempt at an American Zollverein to support a broken-down fiscal policy, saying:

¹¹⁹ *Harper's Weekly*, January 4, 1890.

¹²⁰ Gail Hamilton, *Biography of James G. Blaine*, p. 715.

¹²¹ For a good, dispassionate discussion of the results of this Conference see *Supplement to the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, May 1906, p. 7., and the *Second Pan-American Conference, Mexico, 1901-2*, Mexican Government Printing Office, 1902, p. 4.

¹²² The *New York Nation* (October 3, 1889) asserted that the State Department at Washington had received a great many extracts from foreign newspapers regarding the congress. "These extracts express a good deal of concern and even alarm over the dire results for European trade which may come from Mr. Blaine's intention to persuade the South Americans to become our commercial vassals." But, it adds: "it is hardly possible . . . that the economists of Europe are lying awake nights in dread of the Washington Congress." Foreign opinion generally was opposed to the conference.

¹²³ Cited in the *New York Nation*, October 3, 1889.

¹²⁴ Cited in the *London Times*, October 1, 1889.

On the very immensity of their conception, the project of a Customs Union for all the Americas is likely to go to wreck.¹²⁵

The *London Times* asserted:

If the delegates go home pleased with their hosts, impressed by the magnitude of the country, and anxious to revisit it . . . [at the time of the coming world's fair], the Pan-American Congress will have done as much as can be reasonably expected.¹²⁶

In December, 1889, W. W. Phelps wrote to Mr. Blaine from Berlin:

I hope the Pan-American Congress is producing as good an impression at home, and doing as good work for us, as foreigners think it is. They have had great dislike and suspicions of it from the start, and were dazed by the opening speech, so masterly, so persuasive, and yet with not a single peg on which they could hang a complaint, or a flaw into which they could thrust a sneer. . . .¹²⁷

The *Handels-Museum* (Vienna), of January 9, 1890, concludes an article concerning the American conference by saying, in all probability European exporters have no reason whatever to fear American competition in the markets of Central and South America.¹²⁸ Señor Castelar, the great Spanish orator, in a letter in *Golignani's Messenger* (January 30, 1890) affirmed that he could not

understand how such a positive people as the Americans should have a Minister with such an Utopian and dreamy intelligence as Mr. Blaine,

¹²⁵ Cited in *New York Nation*, October 3, 1889.

¹²⁶ Cited in *Harper's Weekly*, October 19, 1889. The *London Times* followed the conference in its news columns, commenting generally on how little was accomplished and featuring the bickerings and squabbles. On December 4, 1889, its correspondent in Philadelphia wrote: "The public evinces some curiosity to find out when this Congress will begin business, having done nothing yet, with slight apparent prospects ahead" (issue of December 6, 1889). A typical citation in the columns of the *Times* was: "The Pan-American Congress met today but without doing anything and adjourned till Monday (January 4, 1890). On February 24, 1890, the congress is spoken of as "lying dormant".

¹²⁷ Gail Hamilton, *Biography of James G. Blaine*, p. 713.

¹²⁸ Cited in *New York Nation*, April 3, 1890.

and he insinuated that Mr. Blaine dreams of conquest in the guise of a commercial union, although nothing, he predicts, can come of such a scheme.¹²⁹

In regard to the results of the conference the *Revue Sud-Américaine*, on May 18, 1890, remarked that "from the standpoint of immediate practical results" it is not very

flattering to Mr. Blaine. . . . Wholly platonic recommendations, which even so encountered a good deal of dissent, all the main proposals aborted—there is the balance-sheet of the Pan-American Congress.

It believed further that the conference "has been a weighty warning to the protectionists of Europe" and that one of its results will be to stimulate trade between Europe and Hispanic America because it has been demonstrated that the United States is not in a position to have a foreign trade.¹³⁰

The *Journal des Économistes* in May, 1890, asserted that the Congress "adjourned without having reached any result but a platonic resolution in favor of abtitration." And it asked: "How could it have been otherwise?" Continuing, it affirmed that the United States wanted to shut South American commerce off from Europe, although

the South Americans do not seem to have discovered any motive for protecting the industries of their northern brethren at their own expense.¹³¹

Opposition toward Mr. Blaine meant opposition toward the congress and when Mr. Blaine left office in June, 1892, and when President Harrison was superseded by President Cleveland on March 4, 1893, many in this country and abroad felt constrained to rejoice. The *Revista Ilustrada*, a South American Journal, asserted that Cleveland's election had "been received with great satisfaction from the Rio Grande to the La Plata".¹³² The *Rio News*, an Argentina paper, claimed to be edited by an American but probably English inspired, said on November 15, 1892:

¹²⁹ Cited in *New York Nation*, February 13, 1890.

¹³⁰ Cited in *New York Nation*, June 5, 1890.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*

¹³² Cited in *New York Nation*, December 22, 1892.

The native press has been very complimentary to Mr. Cleveland upon his election to the Presidency of the United States. The fact seems to be that South America was always nervous over President Harrison's foreign policy, and expects Mr. Cleveland's Secretary will show less inclination to have a finger in every pie.¹³³

And the *London Times* in an editorial at the time of Mr. Blaine's death said:

. . . As Secretary of State his management of international affairs was not such as to gain him credit for prudence or moderation or for a sense of international justice. He was never at any pains to conceal his unfriendliness to this country.¹³⁴

The conference having finished its work, President Harrison undertook to carry out its recommendations and make them effective. Consequently, in special messages to Congress, he submitted the various proposals requesting that they be given careful consideration, adding his own opinion somewhat at length in regard to each. And before his second annual message of December 1, 1890, all had been submitted.

Meanwhile Mr. Blaine had not been inactive in endeavoring to keep faith with the Hispanic American powers. Immediately after the close of the conference he wrote to President Harrison submitting the report of the meetings in favor of reciprocity. On June 19, 1890, this report was sent to congress. But that body was not to be persuaded as easily as President Harrison had been regarding the advantages of following the recommendations of the conference. In fact, it was about to formulate a tariff bill—the McKinley Bill—with just the features Mr. Blaine did not want. On April 10, 1890, the secretary had written to Mr. McKinley asserting that certain provisions of the bill were a "slap in the face to the South Americans with whom we are trying to enlarge our trade". Later, in a letter to President Harrison, Mr. Blaine affirmed that the Hispanic American powers desired to enter into reciprocal commercial relations with the United States and hoped that the tariff bill might be amended

¹³³ *Ibid.*

¹³⁴ *London Times*, January 28, 1893. Mr. Blaine died the day before.

authorizing the President to declare the ports of the United States free to all products of any nation of the American hemisphere upon which no export duties are imposed, whenever and so long as such nation shall admit to its ports

free of all taxes commodities, of which he gave a list.¹³⁵

Finally, however, the bill, with its reciprocity clause became a law on October 1, 1890. It was, however, not so gracious in form as Mr. Blaine would have chosen, but he was on the other hand not overly displeased, for section three partially set forth his ideas of reciprocal trade with Hispanic America.¹³⁶ In accordance with this act, on February 5, 1891, the president proclaimed a Convention between the United States and Brazil for securing reciprocal trade between the two countries.¹³⁷ This treaty was soon followed by others in South America, Europe, and the West Indies until finally some twenty treaties of reciprocity had been negotiated.¹³⁸ Thus was the champion of closer Pan-American relations rewarded for his efforts, for in these treaties

Mr. Blaine saw not only the clear and definite beginning, but the orderly and beneficent development of his policy of peace, of mutual benefit, of practical human brotherhood.¹³⁹

A. CURTIS WILGUS.

¹³⁵ Gail Hamilton, *Biography of James G. Blaine*, p. 682.

¹³⁶ See *Tariff Act of October 1, 1890*, pp. 50-51. Washington Government Printing Office, 1891, prepared by John M. Carson.

¹³⁷ Gail Hamilton, *Biography of James G. Blaine*, p. 689. This treaty the English in Brazil tried to belittle by abusing both governments (*ibid.*, p. 690).

¹³⁸ Within two years after 1890, eight reciprocal commercial treaties were made with Hispanic American states or with European governments for their colonies in America (see A. B. Hart: *The Monroe Doctrine, an Interpretation*, Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1916, p. 188).

¹³⁹ Gail Hamilton, *Biography of James G. Blaine*, p. 690. The Frankfort *Zeitung* on December 10, 1891, said: "The commercial ideas of the American Secretary of State, Mr. Blaine, are entirely original" and they have "in the latest commercial negotiations, proven its [their] eminent wisdom most brilliantly. . . . Mr. Blaine's idea has secured for the United States treaties with Brazil, Cuba and with other of the Latin-American States, and thus brings Mr. Blaine's great Pan-American scheme nearer realization" (*ibid.*, p. 691). Gail Hamilton further stated that it was asserted "not by partisans but by critics", that Mr.

Blaine's securing of reciprocity treaties was a victory, and, together with his other plans regarding Hispanic America "was the most comprehensive scheme of statesmanship propounded in this hemisphere". It was gained at little cost and was based upon "the most accurate knowledge of the needs and resources of the South-American countries ever possessed by an American statesman". It was obtained "by employing and developing the trained instincts of business" (*ibid.*, p. 690). For further favorable expressions regarding the good of the Pan-American movement see *Speeches Incident to the Visit of Senator Root to South America, July 4, to September 30, 1906.*, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1906, and Charles M. Pepper, *Life and Times of Henry Gassaway Davis*, New York, The Century Co., 1920. For a radical opposition to such a movement, although it is unconvincing, see G. W. Critchfield, *American Supremacy*, 2 vols., New York, Brentano, 1908.